

State of California

Department of Education

# Last Minute Memorandum

**To: STATE BOARD MEMBERS**

**Date: Nov. 7, 2003**

**From: Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent  
Curriculum and Instruction Branch**

**Re: ITEM # 23**

**Subject IMMEDIATE INTERVENTION/UNDERPERFORMING SCHOOLS  
PROGRAM (II/USP): PROPOSED INTERVENTION FOR (COHORTS I AND  
II) SCHOOLS THAT FAILED TO SHOW SIGNIFICANT GROWTH.**

Attached are two charts that provide current API information on the II/USP Cohort I and II schools subject to state intervention. Information includes the appropriate years of Base API, Growth API, and whether or not the school made schoolwide and comparable growth targets.

Schools with an asterisk do not have valid API Growth data. This typically occurred when a school did not test a sufficient number of students or had testing irregularities.

The schools listed in Attachments 3 and 4 represent those schools failing to demonstrate significant growth as part of the October 24<sup>th</sup> Growth API release. There are likely to be additional schools that fail to demonstrate significant growth as part of the December Growth API release. The following three schools were listed in Item #23 as subject to state intervention but, as a result of data updates, they will be removed from this status:

1. Menlo Oaks Elementary of Ravenswood City Elementary School District closed in 2002 and should not have appeared on the list.
2. The Hoopa Valley Elementary School in Klamath-Trinity Joint Unified School District previously had an invalid API due to testing irregularities of more than 5% of the students. The data have been corrected as the number of students involved in the testing irregularities was less than previously reported.
3. Lincoln Development Center in Ontario-Montclair Elementary School District did not have a valid API because an insufficient number of students were tested. However, half of their student population were subject to the CAPA; with the addition of the CAPA data, they have the required 85% assessment participation rate.

Attachment 5 consists of Powerpoint slides that will be part of the information presented for Item #23.

Attachments to be inserted:

[Attachment 3](#): II/USP Cohort I Schools Subject to State Intervention (Pages 1-2)

[Attachment 4](#): II/USP Cohort II Schools Subject to State Intervention (Page 1-1)

[Attachment 5](#): Powerpoint of 2003 SAIT Process (Pages 1-3)

### II/USP Cohort I Schools Subject to State Intervention

District	School	2000 Base	2001 Growth	2001 Sch Wide	2001 Comp Imp	2001 Base	2002 Growth	2002 Sch Wide	2002 Comp Imp	2002 Base	2003 Growth	2003 Sch Wide	2003 Comp Imp
Alum Rock Union Elementary	Pala Middle	532	7	No	No	546	59	Yes	Yes	613	0	No	No
Antelope Elementary	Berrendos Middle	720	56	Yes	Yes	774	-23	No	No	744	-3	No	No
Biggs Unified	Biggs Elementary	669	19	Yes	Yes	694	-1	No	No	678	-99	No	Yes
Biggs Unified	Biggs High	652	-64	No	No	590	50	Yes	Yes	538	** -88	No	No
Burbank Unified	Providencia Elementary	670	45	Yes	No	712	47	Yes	Yes	748	-1	No	No
Central Union High	Central High	542	18	Yes	Yes	561	-1	No	No	613	-3	No	No
Central Union High	Southwest High	560	8	No	No	573	8	No	No	625	-27	No	No
Compton Unified	Centennial High	416	-4	No	No		*				*		
East Side Union High	Lick (James) High	518	-5	No	No	513	4	No	No	524	-4	No	No
Emery Unified	Anna Yates Elementary	693	6	Yes	No	687	-12	No	No		*		
Emery Unified	Emery High	491	-36	No	No	467	21	Yes	No		*		
Galt Joint Union High	Galt High	614	36	Yes	Yes	642	-11	No	No	627	-6	No	No
Mendota Unified	McCabe Junior High	482	81	Yes	Yes	582	-13	No	No		*		
Merced City Elementary	Reyes (Alicia) Elementary	519	39	Yes	Yes	566	18	Yes	No		*		
Merced City Elementary	Rivera (Rudolph) Middle	639	10	Yes	No	639	10	Yes	No	671	-20	No	No
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Del Rey Woods Elementary	623	-29	No	No	610	13	Yes	No	631	-15	No	No
Monterey Peninsula Unified	Ord Terrace Elementary	559	39	Yes	Yes	609	-25	No	No		*		
Oakland Unified	Stonehurst Elementary		*				*				*		
Ontario-Montclair Elementary	Lehigh Elementary	477	11	No	No	505	** -6	No	No		*		
Palo Verde Unified	Palo Verde High	547	41	Yes	Yes	594	-20	No	No	585	-8	No	No
Perris Elementary	Sanders (Nan) Elementary	647	52	Yes	Yes	694	1	No	No	685	-42	No	No
San Diego Unified	Balboa Elementary YR	447	15	No	No		*				*		
San Diego Unified	Fulton Elementary	682	-43	No	No	642	51	Yes	Yes	688	-10	No	No
San Francisco Unified	Burton (Phillip & Sala) Academic High	599	-33	No	No	570	69	Yes	Yes	664	-36	No	No

\* Invalid API Growth Data

\*\* API Growth Data was invalidated

11/17/2003

II/USP Cohort I Schools Subject to State Intervention													
District	School	2000 Base	2001 Growth	2001 Sch Wide	2001 Comp Imp	2001 Base	2002 Growth	2002 Sch Wide	2002 Comp Imp	2002 Base	2003 Growth	2003 Sch Wide	2003 Comp Imp
San Francisco Unified	Golden Gate Elementary	544	5	No	No	573	36	Yes	Yes	634	-35	No	No
San Francisco Unified	Malcolm X Academy (Elem)	549	15	Yes	No	570	-17	No	No	576	-40	No	No
San Francisco Unified	Marshall (Thurgood) Academic High	599	6	No	No	606	12	Yes	No	615	-9	No	No
San Jose Unified	Hester Elementary	558	23	Yes	No	590	91	Yes	Yes	671	-5	No	No
Selma Unified	Wilson (Woodrow) Elementary	649	-40	No	No	614	27	Yes	Yes	639	-7	No	No
Tulare Joint Union High	Tulare Western High	624	-6	No	No	621	2	No	No		*		
West Fresno Elementary	West Fresno Elementary	490	-56	No	No	448	70	Yes	Yes	534	-35	No	No

\* Invalid API Growth Data

\*\* API Growth Data was invalidated

11/17/2003

## II/USP Cohort II Schools Subject to State Intervention

County	District	School	2001 Base	2002 Growth	2002 Sch Wide	2002 Comp Imp	2002 Base	2003 Growth	2003 Sch Wide	2003 Comp Imp
Alameda	Hayward Unified	Tennyson High		*				*		
Los Angeles	Inglewood Unified	Woodworth (Clyde) Elementary	694	-13	No	No	684	-68	No	No
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Fairfax Senior High		*				*		
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Bancroft (Hubert Howe) Middle		*				*		
Riverside	Jurupa Unified	Rubidoux High	559	-11	No	No		*		
San Diego	San Diego Unified	O'Farrell Community Charter		*				*		
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Treasure Island Elementary	618	-8	No	No	611	-10	No	No
Ventura	Rio Elementary	Rio Plaza Elementary	576	-9	No	No		*		

\* Invalid API Growth data

11/17/2003

# SAIT Training

School Assistance and  
Intervention Team  
(SAIT)

# Purpose of SAIT

- To provide schools and districts with immediate intervention and support for rapid and significant improvement in reading/language arts and mathematics

# Rationale for changing the SAIT process:

- Imperative for rapid improvement in student achievement or more serious consequences
- Adopted strategy intended to leverage immediate, systemic instructional change in reading/language arts and mathematics
- Resource costs for increasingly large number of schools



# Essential Program Components are the infrastructure of the system

- State Board-approved or -aligned instructional materials, including interventions
- Effective use of instructional time, including additional time for interventions
- Use of pacing schedules, and at the middle and high school, the design of a master schedule that supports instruction for intensive and strategic students

# Essential Program Components

- AB 466 training for teachers in locally adopted materials
- AB 75 training for instructional leaders
- Assessment and Monitoring system to track student progress and target need for instructional changes

# Essential Program Components

- Instructional assistance and support, including content experts, coaches and specialists
- Teacher grade level/department level collaborative meetings around data and lesson study
- Alignment of general and categorical funds in a Single School Plan for student achievement

# Activities following SPI/SBE assignment of SAIT to state-monitored schools

- LEAs contract with Approved SAIT
- LEA, with SAIT advice, decides on District/School Liaison Team (DSLTL)
- DSLTL and school complete an Academic Program Survey of nine Essential Program Components for instructional success
- SAIT meets with district and school to verify presence of Essential Program Component

# Outcome of Level I SAIT: Essential Program Components **not** substantially in place

- Initial SAIT report, including APS with documentation, describes status of each of nine Essential Program Components.
- Report of Findings and Recommended Corrective Actions call for missing Components to be purchased, installed, and implemented and Single School Plan revised

# Continuing Level I SAIT:

- SAIT-developed corrective actions include benchmarks negotiated with District/School Liaison team, and detail everyone's role in getting Essential Program Components in place
- If identified in November 2003, the school should have Essential Program Components in place by June 2004 and will implement them throughout the year ending June 2005, with SAIT support

# Expanded District role in SAIT

- District matches SAIT resources
- District appoints District/School Liaison Team (DSLTL) to work with the SAIT
- DSLTL completes Academic Program Survey
- DSLTL facilitates communication among school, district, teachers, parent community, and SAIT
- DSLTL helps develop benchmarks and provides support for corrective actions

# The Level II SAIT occurs:

- Immediately after Level I, if the components are substantially in place; or
- After 18 months when the components are in evidence and significant growth has failed to occur



# Level II SAIT

- ◆ Assumes the presence of the Essential Program Components as documented in the Academic Program Survey
- ◆ Focuses on deep analysis of the English/language arts and mathematics programs to assess barriers to student achievement and support classroom instruction

# In sum, both Level I and Level II SAITs focus on support

- The most important SAIT function is to provide intensive support and expertise to help the school implement the corrective actions and benchmarks
  - ◆ Level I: Getting Essential Program Components in place
  - ◆ Level II: Intensive professional development, content, pedagogy, and coaching